

Serial No.: 09/555,057

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2005, claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-39, and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37 have been amended. Claims 1-43 are pending and under consideration. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Certified Copy of Priority Document

The Examiner has previously acknowledged the claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, but has not yet indicated whether the certified copy of the priority document has been received. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of same.

Entry Of Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Applicants requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**Rejection Based on Straub, et al. and Nawaz, et al.**

In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2005, claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-39, and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub, et al. (U.S. Patent No.

Serial No.: 09/555,057

6,216,141) in view of Nawaz, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,621). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1 has been amended to recite that "when the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area is designated, the display means displays the source data linked to the selected image data on a display area separate from the moving display area and the user selected stationary display area of the display means" and "the image data on the moving display area, the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed." Amended Independent claims 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37 have been similarly amended. Support for these amendments to the independent claims can be found in Figure 10 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nawaz nor Straub, teach or suggest that, when the selected image data on the user selected stationary display is designated, the display means displays the source data linked to the selected image data on a display area separate from the moving display area and the user selected stationary display area of the display means. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nawaz nor Straub teach or suggest that the image data on the moving display area, the selected image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed.

As Nawaz and Straub, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37 are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Based on Straub, et al., Nawaz, et al., and Kisiel

In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2004, claims 26, 33, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub, et al. in view of Nawaz, et al. and further in view of Kisiel (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,586). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As discussed previously, the amended independent claims are believed to patentably distinguish over Straub and Nawaz. Accordingly, as claims 26, 33, and 40 depend from the

Serial No.: 09/555,057

distinguished independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26, 33, and 40 also patentably distinguish over the foregoing references for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

Serial No.: 09/555,057

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/8/05

By: Allison Olenginski
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on August 8, 2005
STAAS & HALSEY
By: [Signature]
Date: 8/8/05